

SS-8 Determination—Determination for Public Inspection

Occupation 02SAL Salespersons	Determination: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee <input type="checkbox"/> Contractor
UILC	Third Party Communication: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> Yes

I have read Notice 441 and am requesting:

- Additional redactions based on categories listed in section entitled "Deletions We May Have Made to Your Original Determination Letter"
- Delay based on an on-going transaction
- 90 day delay

For IRS Use Only:

Facts of Case

The worker initiated the request for a determination of their work status as a real estate assistant for tax year 2018, for which they received Form 1099-MISC. The worker filed Form SS-8 as she believes she erroneously received Form 1099-MISC.

The firm's response, signed by its Vice President, states the business specializes in real estate. The firm stated that the worker was engaged as a real estate assistant who processed mail, created social media posts and marketing material. The worker was classified as an independent contractor due to her tasks involving the writing and creating of marketing material. There was no written contract between the two parties.

The firm provided training and/or instruction to the worker. The firm provided work assignments to the worker. The firm determined the methods by which assignments were performed. The firm was responsible for problem or complaint resolution. Reports were required. Meetings were not required by the worker. The worker was not required to provide services personally. The hiring of substitutes or helpers was the firm's responsibility.

The firm provided an office, office supplies, computer program, and Internet. The worker provided a computer. The worker did not lease any equipment, space, or a facility. The worker was paid an hourly rate of pay; a drawing account for advances was not allowed. The worker incurred no expenses in the performance of her services. The firm established the level of payment for the services provided and customers paid the firm.

The worker received no benefits from the firm. There was no agreement prohibiting competition between the parties. The worker did not advertise or maintain a business office. The firm represented the worker as an assistant of the firm. The worker ended the relationship.

Analysis

Generally, the relationship of employer and employee exists when the person for whom the services are performed has the right to control and direct the individual who performs the services, not only as to what is to be done, but also how it is to be done. It is not necessary that the employer actually direct or control the individual, it is sufficient if they have the right to do so.

Section 31.3121(d)-1(a)(3) of the regulations provides that if the relationship of an employer and employee exists, the designation or description of the parties as anything other than that of employer and employee is immaterial. Thus, if an employer-employee relationship exists, any contractual designation of the employee as a partner, co-adventurer, agent, or independent contractor must be disregarded. Furthermore, whether there is an employment relationship is a question of fact and not subject to negotiation between the parties.

Therefore, the payer's statement that the worker was an independent contractor is without merit. For federal employment tax purposes, it is the actual working relationship that is controlling and not the terms of the contract (oral or written) between the parties.

Integration of the worker's services into the business operations generally shows that the worker is subject to direction and control. When the success or continuation of a business depends to an appreciable degree upon the performance of certain services, the workers who perform those services must necessarily be subject to a certain amount of control by the owner of the business. In this case, the instructional services performed by the worker were integral to the payer's business operation. The payer provided work assignments by virtue of the clients served, determined the methods by which assignments were performed, and assumed responsibility for problem resolution. These facts evidence the payer retained the right to direct and control the worker to the extent necessary to ensure satisfactory job performance in a manner acceptable to the payer. Based on the worker's education, past work experience, and work ethic the payer may not have needed to frequently exercise its right to direct and control the worker; however, the facts evidence the payer retained the right to do so if needed.

Payment by the hour, week, or month generally points to an employer-employee relationship, provided that this method of payment is not just a convenient way of paying a lump sum agreed upon as the cost of a job. In such instances, the payer assumes the hazard that the services of the worker will be proportionate to the regular payments. This action warrants the assumption that, to protect its investment, the payer has the right to direct and control the performance of the workers. Also, workers are assumed to be employees if they are guaranteed a minimum salary or are given a drawing account of a specified amount that need not be repaid when it exceeds earnings. In this case, the worker did not invest capital or assume business risks. The term "significant investment" does not include tools, instruments, and clothing commonly provided by employees in their trade; nor does it include education, experience, or training. Based on the rate of pay arrangement the worker could not realize a profit or incur a loss.

Factors that illustrate how the parties perceive their relationship include the intent of the parties as expressed in written contracts; the provision of, or lack of employee benefits; the right of the parties to terminate the relationship; the permanency of the relationship; and whether the services performed are part of the service recipient's regular business activities. In this case, the worker was not engaged in an independent enterprise, but rather the services performed by the worker were a necessary and integral part of the payer's business. Both parties retained the right to terminate the work relationship at any time without incurring a liability. There is no evidence to suggest the worker performed similar services for others as an independent contractor or advertised business services to the general public during the term of this work relationship. The classification of a worker as an independent contractor should not be based primarily on the fact that a worker's services may be used on a temporary, part-time, or as-needed basis. As noted above, common law factors are considered when examining the worker classification issue.

Based on the above analysis, we conclude that the payer had the right to exercise direction and control over the worker to the degree necessary to establish that the worker was a common law employee, and not an independent contractor operating a trade or business.

The payer can obtain additional information related to worker classification online at www.irs.gov; Publication 4341.